

The Schley Case A correspondent of the New York Journal puts the Sampson-Schley case in a nut shell when he says:

1. Sampson's admirers claim that he was the victor, while he (Sampson) was never in the firing line (which was absolutely true).
 2. Schley's admirers say that he won the battle, being there all the time and following the enemy. Now, as we are in possession of the facts, let the public decide between the two.
1. Is Sampson a hero because he was not there?
 2. Is Schley a coward because he was there and won?

Watered Stock The industrial commission has to the amount of recently completed some interesting figures relating to the United States Steel Corporation, otherwise known as the steel trust. The commission's investigations confirm the popular suspicion that this trust has in its stock a vast amount of water. The commission claims that nearly one-third of the entire capital of this trust is water. It will be remembered that Mr. Schwab, president of the trust, testified that in the organization of the trust the property was under valued rather than over valued. The commission declares that this claim is without basis and that the amount of watered stock in the trust will reach the sum of \$300,000,000.

A Lesson in Religious Liberty The Czar of Russia has given us a little lesson in religious liberty. Recently M. Pobedonostoff, the procurator of the Russian-Polish synod, called upon the czar and complained that some of the students of the university did not entertain religious views in harmony with those of the czar. A St. Petersburg dispatch, referring to this visit, says:

"The czar told him to mind his own business. He did not think that justice is to be meted out to the orthodox alone. A little earlier Pobedonostoff had proposed to the czar that in the blank application for army officers seeking promotion a column be added in which the officer should state his religion. The czar ordered him brought into his presence, and excitedly told him he did not care a brass farthing what religion his officers professed; what he wanted was loyal, able servants."

A Terrible "Crime" in Connecticut. Edward H. Curtis is the son of a bank cashier living at Southington, Connecticut. Young Curtis loved a working girl, and against the objections of his aristocratic father insisted upon marrying the girl of his choice. Young Curtis held a responsible position in his father's bank, and as soon as his parent made known his serious objections to his new daughter-in-law the son promptly resigned his position in the bank and obtained a place as motorman on a trolley line. He asserts that he does not care to be under further obligations to a parent who will not recognize his son's wife.

Evidently there is good metal in this young man. If the father himself has any brains worthy of mention he will in time come to appreciate the sterling qualities of his determined

offspring. The only objection to the bride was that she had been a working girl. A more unjust and absurd criticism could not be conceived in this intelligent age.

"A Shameless, Wicked Will." A New York millionaire who recently died, designated his mistress as one of his chief legatees. In fact, the mistress in this millionaire's will was placed on a plane with the millionaire's widow. In a newspaper interview the widow publicly resented the act of her late husband in associating the name of a pure wife with that of an impure woman. Commenting upon this indignant protest, the New York World hits the nail on the head when it says:

"All rightly constituted minds that retain a prejudice in favor of family ties, respectability and correct living will be inclined to share the widow's view that a will which puts a man's mistress on the same plane with his blameless wife, and gives to the former the home that is most closely associated with the family name and traditions, is 'a shameless, wicked will.'"

"The sort of 'honor' that is affected by 'men of the world' might lead a rich voluptuary to deal generously with his woman 'friend;' but surely a finer instinct would induce him to make the settlement privately, and not class her openly with his family in a will. Why is it that 'a good fellow' among men is so often a brute in his dealings with women?"

Protesting Against Tariff. The Monthly Bulletin of the Fidelity and Casualty Company, speaking of the present tariff, says:

"Such a condition cannot continue. It makes our people bondmen in a kind of industrial slavery. It deprives them of the right to buy in the world's markets. It robs the many to enrich a few. It is wrong from an economic standpoint. It is wrong morally. The government has the right to impose tariffs for purposes of revenue or to subserve the general interest. It has no right to maintain a tariff which yields no revenue, which serves the general interests not at all, but does severely burden the consuming public. That is nothing more nor less than the promotion and protection of robbery."

"All this is pertinent to the plate glass situation. The prices of the trust are beyond the cost of importing glass plus the duties. We are subjected to threats that we will be attacked in our business if we buy imported goods. Is a trust that makes such threats wise? The people of this country at large are greater than the little section of them that manufactures plate glass. We suspect that we can rest content in the idea that our plate glass friends are capable of understanding this simple proposition."

"The Most Distinguished Living American Historian." It develops that Edward S. Maclay, the author of the "History of the United States Navy," in which work Admiral Schley was outrageously assailed, was formerly an editorial writer on the New York Sun, a newspaper that has accustomed itself to abusing the hero of Santiago bay. Mr. Maclay's book has, by order of Secretary Long, been excluded from the text books used at the naval academy at Annapolis.

In that book Maclay referred to Admiral

Schley as "A Micawber Admiral." He charged that Schley "exhibited either a timidity amounting to absolute cowardice or a prevarication of facts that were absolute falsehoods." He alleged that Admiral Schley "turned in caitiff flight from the danger spot toward which duty, honor and the whole American people were most earnestly urging him." He said that Schley's warship furnished "the most shameful spectacle of deliberately turning tail and running away."

The New York Sun in order to bolster up Mr. Maclay refers to him as "the most distinguished living American historian." It is strange that a man designated as "the most distinguished living American historian" would find it necessary to resort to the lowest form of abuse in dealing with an historical character. Men distinguished as historians are presumed to state facts and to state them in such a way as to impress upon the reader the impartiality of the writer. But this "most distinguished living American historian" shows that he is a partisan of the partisans; and the observer is justified in the suspicion that if Mr. Maclay does not entertain personal malice toward Admiral Schley, other men who did have that malice have engaged him as the medium for foul slanders.

A Novel Position for a Great Historian. It seems that this "most distinguished historian" is a clerk in the Brooklyn navy yard. It is strange that this navy yard clerk has discovered cowardice and general unworthiness in a man whom the American people, regardless of political prejudice, delight to honor. It is strange that in spite of the persistent efforts to discredit the important part Admiral Schley played in the Santiago battle, the American people have come quite generally to make him the hero of that battle. It will be interesting to observe what disposition the administration will make of this navy yard clerk, otherwise known as "the most distinguished living American historian." As a historian he was discredited, not so much by the ban placed by the secretary of the navy upon his works, as by the character of those works. As a clerk in the navy yards he should be displaced because of his outrageous assaults upon a man who has been the patient victim of the most remarkable series of attacks recorded in American history. It is not at all likely that this "most distinguished living American historian" is at all dependent upon his salary as clerk. It may rather be suspected that his employment as clerk in the navy yards was merely a cover whereby he could carry out the work mapped out for him. From the beginning the attacks upon Admiral Schley have been wholly discreditable. From the beginning nothing has developed to the discredit of Admiral Schley. He has been extremely patient under the most bitter attacks. The American people will keep a very close eye upon the Sampson-Schley affair, and they will not lose sight of the disposition made by the administration of the "most distinguished living American historian."